

Today's Topics:

Modifiying radios for out of band operation (3 msgs)

SPICE

Squeaky Appeals do not get greased!

TS-680S vs. IC-726

What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.

-----

Date: 8 Dec 89 22:35:49 GMT

From: silver!amirza@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu (anmar mirza)

Subject: Modifiying radios for out of band operation

Message-ID: <31140@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu>

Ahh, I understand, ken thinks that I feel that my work as an EMT,  
and my patients are not a very important issue with me.

Well, they are.

Also, where is it a LAW that I cannot transmit out of bands on my radio?

Last I looked, it was merely a regulation through the FCC, not a LAW.

I also seem to remember something about certain regulations that are  
suspended during emergencies, I highly doubt that I would get cited  
for using my radio in good faith out of band during an emergency,  
just as I wouldn't get cited for using my radio and an autopatch  
to order rock moving equipment or other needed equipment during the  
emergency, even though it could be classified as business. I also doubt  
that a novice would get cited for transmit on 2 meters, during an emergency.  
I don't see how I could be cited for breaking a regulation that was  
suspended, if you do, I am sure you will tell me.

Aside from my personal safety, a patient (someone who has entrusted me  
with their life) comes first, and if it will benefit my patient, and  
hurt no one else, I will do it.

-----

Date: 8 Dec 89 22:48:34 GMT

From: silver!amirza@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu (anmar mirza)

Subject: Modifiying radios for out of band operation

Message-ID: <31142@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu>

In article <7425@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:

>In article <798@rsiatl.UUCP>, jgd@rsiatl.UUCP (John G. De Armond) writes:  
>>

>> Next, commercial and Public service. The law specifically permits the  
>> use of ANY communications mode to mitigate a life-threatening situation.

<much material deleted>

>John,

>

>member of the general public. Therefore it wpould be a good idea if every

>motorist, indeed everyone in the country, carried a transmitter capable of  
>operation on police/fire/ambulance/ham/CB frequencies in case they came on  
>a similar situation. Can you see the potential for chaos? A better solution  
>would be a nationwide emergency frequency (similar to the FAA scheme) open to  
>all for use and monitored by all police/fire/emergency services. Please note  
>I don't disagree with most of what you said.

I also see the potential chaos, I never support the idea of a private citizen being able to transmit on ambulance/police/fire, it would be total chaos, your idea for a solution is a good one.  
I support the fact that why should I go and buy four different radios, when one will do it, and the only purpose it will be used for in a non amateur capacity is in an emergency, one that relates to special training that I have received to deal with.

anmar N9ISY

-----  
Date: 9 Dec 89 02:14:52 GMT  
From: zephyr.ens.tek.com!orca.wv.tek.com!porkface2!miker@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Modifiying radios for out of band operation  
Message-ID: <5593@orca.wv.tek.com>

In article <31142@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu> amirza@silver.bacs.indiana.edu (anmar mirza) writes:  
> A better solution  
>would be a nationwide emergency frequency (similar to the FAA scheme) open to  
>all for use and monitored by all police/fire/emergency services.

We already have one of those. It's called channel 9.

-----  
Date: 8 Dec 89 20:32:02 GMT  
From: mailrus!wuarchive!cs.utexas.edu!oakhill!charlie@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu  
(Charlie Thompson)  
Subject: SPICE  
Message-ID: <2716@radio.oakhill.UUCP>

Anybody out there done any XTAL oscillator modelling in SPICE?  
I'd be interested in hearing from anybody with oscillator/SPICE experience.

Thanks,

C.D.T WB4HVD

-----  
Date: Fri, 8 Dec 89 15:31:06 EST  
From: ww@brambo.uucp (Warren W. Gay)  
Subject: Squeaky Appeals do not get greased!  
Message-ID: <8912081531.AA19029@brambo.UUCP>

>Date: Tue, 5 Dec 89 10:30 CDT  
>From: "FEROZ GHOUSE, N9FJL/4S7FG" <FGHOUSE@LAX.WISC.EDU>  
>Subject: PACKET-RADIO Digest V89 #259  
>Message-ID: <19120510304347@lax.wisc.edu>  
>  
>IT IS SAD TO NOTE THAT THIS NET DOES NOT OFFER HELP TO ANYBODY WANTING  
>TO START OUT ON PACKET. INSPITE OF MANY MESSAGES FOR HELP, I HAVE NOT SEEN  
>A SINGLE MAIL MESSAGE OFFERING THE NEEDED ADVICE.

Sad when it happens, but this is NOT true. There is a lot of help and advice given here and elsewhere when more specific questions are asked. By saying "I know nothing, please help" is like saying "I'm unemployed, please feed me".

Ask questions, and you'll get replies. You gotta do a bit of digging fer urself. Nobody here had everything handed to them, without some effort put in first. I know I still do plenty of digging. Its unreasonable to ask someone to "tell me everything I need to know".

(disclaimer-- I don't know what ur original help request was worded like, but I've seen MANY, of the type I'm discussing here. I felt it time to VENT a little).

> ... IT SEEMS THAT THE MEMBERS  
>OF THE NET ARE ENGROSSED IN THEIR OWN LITTLE "PET" PROJECTS AND POSSIBLY  
>CONSIDER THE APPEALS FROM "NEWCOMERS" AND "NO-NOTHINGS" NOT WORTH THEIR  
>WHILE.

When you don't get the answers you need, crying about it does not help. Do some more digging; think about the problem more; or perhaps narrow the scope of the question. We all have a LITTLE time to spare to answer SMALL questions, but as I reply to this note, I'm not doing the work I'm supposed to be doing-- so don't expect a lot. That's not being "engrossed"-- that's being responsible to job and family.

>I APPEAL TO YOU FOLKS TO IF TIME PERMITTING, ...

Ahh, see! Even your subconscious knows that.

>... BEING SELFISH WOULD NOT NECESSARILY WORK IN OUR FAVOR!

er, I think ur saying, "YOUR favour".

I help a lot of people in the hobby, where I can. Most others do the same. But we all have jobs (er, well, most I guess) and many of us have families. It might suit YOU for us to neglect everything to make it easy for YOU, but people's priorities do not work that way.

Join a ham club. Join ARRL/CRRL, buy/borrow some books (please don't steal :-). Don't just plead. That's too easy. None of us got our tickets just by being "squeaky".

Flames off...

73s all the same, VE3WWG.

```
73s de +                               VE3WWG @ VE3NUU : Packet-Radio
VE3WWG |   Bramalea Software Systems Inc...!utgpu!telly \ !brambo!wwg
+-----+   !{uunet!mnetor, watmath!utai}!lsuc!ncrcan /
           telly!brambo!wwg@gpu.utcs.utoronto.ca : Internet
```

-----  
Date: Fri, 08 Dec 89 13:42:34 -0900  
From: <FNDDR%ALASKA.BITNET@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>  
Subject: TS-680S vs. IC-726

snorkelwacker!spdcc!merk!alliant!linus!raybed2!ewb@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu  
(EUGENE BALINSKI) writes:

>In article <8912050806.AA13506@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>, FNDDR@ALASKA.BITNET ("Don  
> Rice, GI 708B, 474-7569", 907) writes:

>> a) I haven't found any reviews or discussions of the IC-726...anyone care  
>> to offer either?

>The IC 726 is basically an IC 725 with the addition of 6 meter. There is  
>a great difference between the 680 and the 726. I believe you will find that  
>the 726 may have better receiver performance with very weak signals, and under  
>high qrm conditions. This is due to Icom's DDS or Direct Digital Synthesis. ...

As an answer to the question, "Why should I pay for the 726 than for the 680," a superior receiver could be worth it to me. The 726 appears to have fewer interference-handling facilities than the 680, though...the 726 has a noise blanker and attenuator, while the 680 has a dual-mode adjustable-level noise blanker, attenuator, and IF shift. Since we are virtually across the street from the <insert your favorite descriptive expletive here> woodpecker, a good noise blanker is worthy of consideration.

>> b) Both have rather wide AM selectivity. Are these useable SWL DX radios?  
>I have listened to both on the SW band. For typical listening they both do  
>a good job. For jam-packed band conditions I have no data.  
Actually, selectivity may be a non-issue, even though QST's reviewer flagged it. -6 dB at 6 kHz appears to be pretty standard for low- and mid-range receivers. Only the high-end receiver specs I've looked at (eg, TS-940) offer better selectivity.

>> I like the 726's receive sensitivity, and the 680's price...other than that,  
>> they both have various (to me) minor pros and cons, but the choice isn't  
>> clear-cut. Any advice would be appreciated.  
>If you can, find someone who has these radios and invite yourself over to  
>their shack (bribe them with pizza if you have to). Spend a few hours with  
>each and do the kind of operating that you plan on. ...  
I'd like to, if I can find someone. The people I know either have old rigs like mine, or sooperdooper nuclear-powered \$2K+ rigs. I'll keep looking.  
Perhaps I should call CQ IC726?

The only e-mail comments I've received are from happy 680 owners. But I would expect the 680 to have a larger following since it is older than the 726.

>> Don Rice  
>> KL7JIIQ  
>> FNDDR@ALASKA.bitnet  
ditto.

>  
>  
73  
Gene WA1UXA  
Thanks for the information, Gene...it helps. I'd like to talk to you direct but it will take some work to get your address rearranged to suit my mailer.  
Don

-----  
Date: 8 Dec 89 22:53:50 GMT  
From: cs.utexas.edu!usc!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!jarthur!uci-ics!turner@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Clark Turner)  
Subject: What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.  
Message-ID: <25803B80.2224@paris.ics.uci.edu>

In article <1250092@hpnmdla.HP.COM> alanb@hpnmdla.HP.COM (Alan Bloom) writes:  
>Antennas are reciprocal -- that is the radiation pattern (directivity),  
>and efficiency are the same for receiving and transmitting. If, for  
>example, the transmitting antenna is down 6 dB in a certain direction  
>on a certain frequency (compared to a resonant dipole), then so will  
>be the antenna when used for receiving.....  
>  
>  
>Al N1AL

You know, this has troubled me ever since I used a "beverage" antenna -  
an ultra-long-wire running very close to the ground. Such an antenna is  
a real dog to use for transmit, but seems to work very well for receiving...  
Is it merely the reduction in noise on the beverage antenna that makes it  
such a fine receiving antenna...and the reason that 160/75 meter DXers will  
use a separate antenna for xmit and rcv?

Thanks for any ideas the net might have to help me with this concept.

-----  
Clark S. Turner  
WA3JPG  
turner@ics.uci.edu  
-----

"When the going gets weird,  
the weird turn pro."  
-Hunter Thompson

-----  
End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #994  
\*\*\*\*\*